

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 INA STEPANOV,

Case No. 2:22-cv-01031-ART-BNW

7 Plaintiff,

ORDER

8 v.

9 STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

10 Defendants.

11 *Pro se* Plaintiff Ina Stepanov (“Stepanov”) brings this action alleging several
12 different violations of law: 42 U.S.C. § 1983, due process, conspiracy to commit
13 real estate fraud, forgery, wrongful foreclosure, breach of contract, real estate
14 deed fraud, and obstruction of the administration of justice. Before the Court is
15 the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States
16 Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler (ECF No. 24), recommending that this Court
17 enter an order denying Stepanov’s motions for a Temporary Protective Order
18 (ECF Nos. 4, 5, and 11), Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 17), Motion for Hearing
19 (ECF No. 20), and Motion for Jurisdictional Challenge (ECF No. 21). Stepanov
20 filed a document titled “Objection to The Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler” (ECF
21 No. 26) but the document does not set forth any objections or arguments or
22 identify any issue to which Stepanov objects. For this reason, and as explained
23 below, the Court adopts the R&R.

24 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings
25 or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where
26 a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not
27 required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of
28 an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v.*

1 *Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the
2 magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one
3 or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis
4 in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that
5 the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the
6 record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

7 Because Stepanov does not identify any issue to which she objects or
8 explain the basis for any objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review,
9 and is satisfied Magistrate Judge Weksler did not clearly err. Ms. Stepanov’s
10 complaint is long and difficult to understand. It appears that she is claiming that
11 her house was illegally sold or is about to be illegally sold (maybe during a
12 foreclosure proceeding) through the use of documents containing forged
13 signatures. Magistrate Judge Weksler was unable to determine what claims
14 Stepanov was attempting to allege against which defendants and could not
15 evaluate whether Stepanov stated any claims for relief. Magistrate Judge Weksler
16 provided Stepanov with some guidance for an amended complaint¹.

17 Magistrate Judge Weksler also recommends that the Court deny
18 Stepanov’s motions for temporary restraining orders and a hearing to stop the
19 foreclosure of her house (ECF Nos. 4, 5, and 11) because Stepanov cannot show
20 that she is entitled to this extraordinary relief. Magistrate Judge Weksler also
21 recommends that the Court deny Stepanov’s Motion to Re-Open Non-Judicial
22 Wrongful Foreclosure (ECF No. 12) because it is premature and there is not even
23 an operative complaint pending in this case.

24 Magistrate Judge Weksler also recommends denying Stepanov’s Motion to
25 Dismiss (ECF No. 17), Motion for Hearing (ECF No. 20), and Motion for
26

27
28

¹ Stepanov has already filed an amended complaint (ECF No. 35) which Judge Weksler has not yet screened.

1 Jurisdictional Challenge (ECF No. 21) without prejudice as premature because
2 there is no operative complaint in this case.

3 Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case, the Court will adopt
4 the R&R in full.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Weksler's Report and
6 Recommendation (ECF No. 24) is accepted and adopted in full.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions for a Temporary
8 Protective Order (ECF Nos. 4, 5, and 11) be DENIED.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 17),
10 Motion for Hearing (ECF No. 20), and Motion for Jurisdictional Challenge (ECF
11 No. 21) be DENIED.

12
13 DATED THIS 12th Day of October 2022.

14
15 

16 ANNE R. TRAUM
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28